REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 9-14 and 22-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,646,689 to Matsuda (hereinafter "Matsuda").

Claim 9-14 and 22-27 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,710,813 to Choo et al. (hereinafter "Choo").

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

A Revocation and Power of Attorney Appointment of New Agent, Change of Correspondence Address and Attorney Docket Number, is submitted concurrently.

Applicants amend claims 9 and 22 by this response. Accordingly, claims 1-27 are pending, with claims 1-8 and 15-21 being withdrawn from consideration.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants note that the PTO-Form 1449 that was attached to the Office Action did not include the Examiner's initials adjacent the listing for U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0191145.

Since U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0191145 is the U.S. patent application publication of U.S. Patent No. 6,710,843, which is cited by the Office Action, Applicants assume that the Examiner has considered U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0191145[1]. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner evidence that consideration by making an

[1] If Applicants' assumption is incorrect, it is respectfully requested that Applicants' undersigned representative be contected.

appropriate notation on the PTO Form 1449 and return a copy of such marked PTO Form 1449 with the next office communication.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 9-14 and 22-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Matsuda. This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that Matsuda does not anticipated claims 9-14 and 22-27 because Matsuda does not teach or suggest each and every element of these claims. For instance, it is respectfully submitted that Matsuda fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination as set forth in independent claim 9 including at least the feature of "wherein the alignment layer line, the liquid crystal layer line, the sealant coating line, the assembling line, and the cutting line are physically connected along a single fabrication line." In addition, it is respectfully submitted that Matsuda fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination as set forth in independent claim 22 including at least "the first, second, third, fourth and fifth units being physically connected along a single fabrication line of the fabrication system."

According to a disclosed embodiment of the present invention, two unified fabrication lines within a single fabrication system for fabricating an LCD device. See, for example, paragraph [0060] of the specification. Further, according to another disclosed embodiment of the present invention, an alignment layer line, a liquid crystal dropping line, a sealant coating line, an assembly line and a cutting ling are incorporated into a single line. See, for example, FIG. 8 of the present invention.

In the rejection, the Office Action cites FIG. 2 of Matsuda as allegedly disclosing Applicants' claimed combinations. However, FIG. 2 of Matsuda and the accompanying description merely illustrate a flow in manufacturing a liquid crystal display and do not teach or suggest a single fabrication system or a single fabrication line. See, for example, column 1, lines 60-62 of

Matsuda. In fact, FIG. 4 of Matsuda illustrates a liquid crystal dropping/resin applying unit (8) physically separated from a processing unit (6) and an UV irradiating unit (7).

M.P.E.P. §2131 states "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every element of the claim." Applicants respectfully submit that since Matsuda does not teach or suggest each and every element of independent claims 9 and 22, Matsuda does not anticipate claims 9 and 22.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10-14 and 23-27 also are allowable at least because of their respective dependence from one of claims 9 and 22, and because of the features recited therein. For instance, it is respectfully submitted that Matsuda does not teach or suggest the claimed combination as set forth in claim 13 including at least "at least one buffer line disposed between each of the alignment layer line, the liquid crystal layer line, the sealant coating line, the assembling line, and the cutting line to synchronize movement of the first and second substrates."

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9-14 and 22-27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under the Judicially Created Doctrine of Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

Claims 9-14 and 22-27 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 8 of Choo. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

M.P.E.P. §804 instructs that "[b]efore consideration can be given to the issue of double patenting, there must be some common relationship of inventorship and/or ownership of two or more patents or applications." Applicants respectfully submit that at least from the face of Choo, Choo has different inventorship and ownership from the present application, such that there is no

basis for double patenting issues. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this provisional double patenting rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited. Should there remain any questions or comments regarding this response or the application in general, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: July 29, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Penny Caudle Penny Caudle Reg. No 46,607
for Song K. Jung
Registration No.: 35,210
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant